

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS PO But 1450 Alexandra, Virginia 22313-1450 www.waybo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/655,558	09/04/2003	Zaida Pericas	030092/ATTWP278USA	6412
55343 AT&T Legal I	7590 06/16/200 Department - T&W	EXAMINER		
Attn: Patent D	ocketing	MAGUIRE, LINDSAY M		
Room 2A-207 One AT&T W			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
Bedminster, N		3692		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			06/16/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Ī	Application No.	Applicant(s)					
	10/655,558	PERICAS ET AL.					
	Examiner	Art Unit					
	LINDSAY M. MAGUIRE	3692					

	LINDSAY M. MAGUIRE	3692	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the o	orrespondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 09 June 2009 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APP	LICATION IN CONDITION FOR A	LLOWANCE.	
 X The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance, (2) a Notice of Appe for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods: 	the same day as filing a Notice of a replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi eal (with appeal fee) in compliance FR 1.114. The reply must be filed	Appeal. To avoid abar t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
 a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date 			
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire Is Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	date of the final rejection	n.
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filled is the date for purposes of determining the period of under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office ther may reduce any earned patient term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL.	on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1: ension and the corresponding amount of hortened statutory period for reply origithan three months after the mailing date	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Office	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed with the filed with th	sion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
<u>AMENDMENTS</u>			
 The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, to They raise new issues that would require further correction. They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below (c)) They are not deemed to place the application in better. 	nsideration and/or search (see NOT w);	E below);	
appeal; and/or	,,,		
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c		ected claims.	
NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . (See 37 CFR 1.1)			
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12		mpliant Amendment (I	PTOL-324).
 Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): 			
Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).		•	•
 For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: 		l be entered and an e	planation of
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected: Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary 	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appear and was not earlier presented. Se	and/or appellant fail ee 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1	s to provide a
 The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER 	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attach	ed.
 The request for reconsideration has been considered but See Continuation Sheet. 	does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:
12. Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (13. Other:	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
de la Allia			
/Kambiz Abdi/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3692			

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 08-06)

Continuation of 3. NOTE: Specifically, the amendments of claims 1, 11-14, 16, 17, 19, 23, 26, 29, and 31 fail to overcome the rejections set forth in the Final Office Action mailed on 3/5/09.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

The amendments to the claims fail to overcome the rejections as set forth in the Final Office Action mailed on 3/5/09. Specifically, applicant's attempt to overcome the 35 USC 101 rejection by adding the phrase, "by a computer" into the claims is insufficient as it is recited in manner that is considered to be extra-added solution that is not needed complete the steps of the method.

In response to applicant's arguments, the recitation "revenue sharing" has not been given patentable weight because the recitation occurs in the preamble. A preamble is generally not accorded any patentable weight where it merely recites the purpose of a process or the intended use of a structure, and where the body of the claim does not depend on the preamble for completeness but, instead, the process steps or structural limitations are able to stand alone. See In re Hirao, 535 F.2d 67, 190 USPQ 15 (CCPA 1976) and Kropa v. Roble, 187 F.2d 150, 152, 88 USPQ 478, 481 (CCPA 1951).

Applicant's arguments have been considered in full, however they are considered non-persuasive in view of the above.